

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated May 9, 2003, the Examiner (1) rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112; (2) rejected claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Mano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,793,336); and (3) rejected claims 4, 5, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mano et al. in view of McNerney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,208).

Applicants by way of this amendment have canceled claims 2-4 and 7-9, and amended claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 5, 6, and 10 remain pending in the application.

With regard to the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112 for insufficient antecedent basis, claim 8 is no longer pending in the application. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that this rejection is now moot.

With regard to the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a), claim 1, as amended, recites, in part, a communication device comprising:

service designating means for designating a service;

* * *

selection means for selecting, on the basis of the acquired attribute information, one or more of the detected communication devices capable of providing the designated service;

display means for displaying discrimination information for discriminating the communication device selected by said selection means;

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Mano et al., the primary reference relied on by the Examiner is directed to a graphical display that displays graphical images representing devices coupled to a bus stream. More particularly, Mano et al. discloses that when a device is added to a serial bus, a graphical image representing that device is automatically displayed. Tasks preformed by the device are also capable of being controlled and monitored by the user via the display. In particular, Mano et al. discloses that a cursor control device is used to choose displayed options, and once selected, controls, commands, and data related to that task are displayed within a control display window.

In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Mano et al. teaches service designating means, wherein the selection means selects, on the basis of the attribute information a communication device capable of providing the service which is designated by the service designating means. In support, the Examiner relied on column 5 line 56 thru column 6 line 3 of Mano et al. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner.

In particular, Mano et al. discloses displaying all the devices attached to the bus. The user can then select from these devices tasks for the devices to perform. As such, Mano et al. discloses displaying all the attached devices - not selecting from the attached devices those that can provide a designated service and displaying discrimination information for just the selected devices.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over Mano et al. for at least the reason that Mano et al. does not disclose service designating means for designating a service, selection means for selecting one or more

of the detected communications devices capable of providing the designated service, and display means for displaying discrimination information for the selected devices.

With regard to McNerny et al., this reference is directed to virtual reality mixed media meeting room functions that provide a user with a visual representation of the various types of communications equipment that is typically present a conference room and is available in the virtual reality mixed media conference. McNerny et al., however, like Mano et al., does not disclose service designating means for designating a service, selection means for selecting one or more of the detected communications devices capable of providing the designated service, and display means for displaying discrimination information for the selected devices. As such, McNerny et al. does not cure the above-noted defects of Mano et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Applicants likewise respectfully submit that independent claim 6 is also allowable for at least the above-stated reasons. Applicants further respectfully submit that claims 5 and 10 that depend directly on independent claims 1 and 6, respectively, are likewise allowable at least due to their dependence on allowable claims 1 and 6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com

Application No. 09/556,483
Customer No. 22,852
Attorney Docket No. 05595.0012

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 8, 2003

By: 

Charles W. Chesney
Reg. No. 45,874

FINNEGAN
HENDERSON
FARABOW
GARRETT &
DUNNER LLP

1300 I Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
202.408.4000
Fax 202.408.4400
www.finnegan.com